

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the pending application in view of the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,627,584) in view of Kanno et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,583,566). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicant's independent claim 1 recites an electronic endoscope system which includes, inter alia, a monitor that displays an endoscope-image, a scene-changing system that changes a scene displayed on the monitor between an endoscope-image-display scene and a patient-data-list-display scene, and a storage system that stores patient data. The patient data includes a patient data list which is displayed on the monitor. The electronic endoscope system also includes a selection system that selects individual patient data from the patient data list displayed on the monitor, and a display-control system that displays the selected individual patient data together with the endoscope-image on the monitor when the scene on the monitor is changed from the patient-data-list-display scene to the endoscope-image-display scene.

Nishikori discloses an embodiment of an endoscope system 1 which includes an operation computer 3 having a touch panel 2. See Figure 1 and col. 5, lines 25-39. The operation computer is used as a man-machine interface for the endoscope system 1. See col. 7, lines 1-2. Various screens of the operation computer 3 are shown in Figures

15A-15J. See col. 10, lines 52-54. Nishikori's endoscope system 1 also includes a monitor 13. See Figure 3 and col. 7, lines 16-23.

Nishikori discloses another embodiment of an endoscope system 213 which includes a monitor 218 which displays endoscopic images. See Figures 32 and 33 and col. 18, line 65 – col. 19, line 23.

Applicant respectfully submits that Nishikori fails to disclose or suggest that an endoscope-image-display scene is displayed on the operation computer 3. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that col. 10, line 55 – col. 11, line 30 of Nishikori discloses this feature. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is mistaken. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that this portion of Nishikori discloses that a CV-100 mode (which is a control mode for using an electronic endoscope) may be selected by touching an appropriate space on the touch panel 2 of operation computer 3. See Figures 15A-15D. Applicant respectfully submits that selection of the CV-100 mode in Nishikori does not result in an endoscope-image-display scene being displayed on the operation computer 3. Instead, Applicant respectfully submits that selection of the CV-100 mode merely causes a scene on the operation computer 3 to switch from one control mode scene, such as those illustrated in Figures 15(B) and 15(C), to the CV-100 mode scene illustrated in Figure 15(A), as shown in Figures 14(D) and 14(E). Applicant respectfully submits that endoscopic images in Nishikori are displayed on the monitor 13 (or monitor 218 in the other embodiment), not the operation computer 3. See, e.g., col. 18, line 65 – col. 19, line 23, where Nishikori discloses that a monitor 218 displays endoscopic images.

Applicant further submits that Nishikori fails to disclose or suggest that a patient-data-list-display scene is displayed on the monitor 13 (or monitor 218 in the other embodiment). Applicant submits that an objective of Nishikori's system is to centralize control of a light source 6 and a video system center 5, such that buttons are selectively displayed on the touch panel 2 of the operational computer 3 which allow selection of a plurality of modes (e.g., a CV-100 mode, a CCU mode, an OES mode, and a data mode). Nishikori's monitor 13 (or 218) does not display these mode selection buttons. Thus, Applicants submit that there would be no motivation to modify the monitor to switch to a patient data list display scene.

Thus, as it is respectfully submitted that Nishikori fails to disclose or suggest a monitor which displays both an endoscope-image-display scene and a patient-data-list-display scene, Applicant respectfully submits that Nishikori also fails to disclose or suggest a scene-changing system that changes a scene displayed on a monitor between an endoscope-image-display scene and a patient-data-list-display scene, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 1.

Kanno discloses an endoscope system which includes an endoscope apparatus 11 having a keyboard 17 for inputting patient information, and a monitor 15 on which patient information is superimposed on video signals of a body cavity. See Figures 5 and 8(a), col. 7, lines 36-59 and col. 11, lines 6-15. Applicant respectfully submits that the monitor 15 does not display a patient-data-list-display scene. Thus, Applicant submits that Kanno's endoscope system does not include a scene-changing system that changes a scene displayed on the monitor 15 between an endoscope-image-display scene and a patient-data-list-display scene.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that if Nishikori were modified with the teachings of Kanno in the manner suggested by the Examiner, this would only result in a patient being selected using Nishikori's touch panel 2, and selected patient data being displayed on the monitor 13 together with an endoscope image, which differs from Applicant's claimed invention.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Nishikori and Kanno fails to disclose or suggest an electronic endoscope system which includes a scene-changing system that changes a scene displayed on a monitor between an endoscope-image-display scene and a patient-data-list-display scene, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 1 is improper, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2, 3, 5 and 6 are also submitted to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 1.

Applicant's independent claim 7 recites an electronic endoscope system and a monitor that displays an endoscope-image. The system includes, inter alia, a scene-changing system that changes a scene displayed on the monitor between a first display mode and a second display mode, and a storage system that stores patient data. The patient data includes a patient data list which is displayed on the monitor when the scene on the monitor is changed from the first display mode to the second display mode. The system also includes a selection system that selects individual patient data, and a display-control system that displays the selected individual patient data together

with the endoscope-image on the monitor when the scene on the monitor is changed from the second display mode to the first display mode.

As discussed above, neither Nishikori nor Kanno disclose or suggest a monitor which displays a patient-data-list-display scene and displays an endoscope-image. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Nishikori and Kanno fails to disclose or suggest an electronic endoscope system in which a patient data list is displayed on a monitor when the scene on the monitor is changed from a first display mode to a second display mode, and which includes a display-control system that displays selected individual patient data together with an endoscope-image on the monitor when the scene on the monitor is changed from the second display mode to the first display mode, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 7.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 7 is improper, and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow claim 7.

Dependent claims 8, 9, 11 and 12 are also submitted to be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 7.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikori et al. in view of Kanno et al, and further in view of Ozawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,154,248). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Ozawa et al. is directed towards an electronic endoscope. Applicant respectfully submits that Ozawa fails to overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Nishikori and Kanno. That is, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Nishikori, Kanno

and Ozawa fails to disclose or suggest an electronic endoscope system which includes a scene-changing system that changes a scene displayed on a monitor between an endoscope-image-display scene and a patient-data-list-display scene, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 1, or an electronic endoscope system in which a patient data list is displayed on a monitor when the scene on the monitor is changed from a first display mode to a second display mode, and which includes a display-control system that displays selected individual patient data together with an endoscope-image on the monitor when the scene on the monitor is changed from the second display mode to the first display mode, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 7.

Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 4 and 10 are allowable, at least in view of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 7, and thus respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow claims 4 and 10.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION


Entry and consideration of the present response, reconsideration of the outstanding Final Office Action, and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and now believed to be appropriate. Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present invention in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so.

Should an extension of time be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, including any extensions of time required to place the application in condition for allowance by an Examiner's Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby

authorized to charge any additional fee to Deposit Account No. 19-0089.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Ryo OZAWA

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bruce H. Bernstein", written over a horizontal line.

Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

April 12, 2006  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191

Steven Wegman  
Reg. No. 31,438